

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Alisha Walker,

Case No. 2:23-cv-00165-CDS-NJK

**Plaintiff**

## Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order

V.

Fellowise Lewis,

[ECF No. 2]

## Defendant

Pro se plaintiff Alisha Walker moves for a temporary restraining order to halt  
cited matters regarding her child in a Chicago family court proceeding. Mot., ECF No. 2 at  
le a document filed pro se is “to be liberally construed,” *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106  
Walker provides neither substantive law nor specific factual assertions that allow me to  
cate her claim on its merits. Even “pro se pleadings must still allege facts sufficient to  
u reviewing court to determine whether a claim has been stated.” *Ivey v. Bd. of Regents of Univ.*  
ea, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982). Furthermore, the local rules of this district require  
ns to be “supported by a memorandum of points and authorities.” LR 7-2(a). “The failure  
oving party to file points and authorities in support of the motion constitutes a consent to  
rial of the motion.” LR 7-2(d). Finding no points of law or authorities cited in support of  
r’s motion for a temporary restraining order, I deny the motion without prejudice.

I further order plaintiff to show cause why this matter should not be unsealed, albeit with the personally identifying information of Walker's minor child redacted. Both the instant motion and Walker's documents initiating this case, ECF No. 1, were filed under seal, but no motion seeking permission to seal the documents accompanied these documents. Local Rule 10-5(a) requires that “[u]nless otherwise permitted by statute, rule, or prior court order, papers

1 filed with the court under seal must be accompanied by a motion for leave to file those  
2 documents under seal. LR IA 10-5. Walker did not comply with this rule, and without more  
3 information, the court cannot assess if the filing should remain sealed.

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order [ECF  
5 No. 2] is DENIED without prejudice.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff has 14 days to respond to this order to show  
7 cause demonstrating why this matter should remain sealed. Failure to respond will result in  
8 the action being unsealed without further notice.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED: February 6, 2023

11  
12   
13 Cristina D. Silva  
United States District Judge

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24